



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,083	02/12/2002	Emil S. Koteles	123-10 US	3084
25319	7590	04/15/2005	EXAMINER	
FREEDMAN & ASSOCIATES 117 CENTREPOINTE DRIVE SUITE 350 NEPEAN, ONTARIO, K2G 5X3 CANADA			HELLNER, MARK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3663	
DATE MAILED: 04/15/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/073,083	KOTELES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark Hellner	3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-74 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,10,15-19 and 34 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2-9,11-14,20-24 and 35-74 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2122002.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 10, 15-19 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Augustsson in view of Li et al.

Augustsson discloses a WDM gain equalizer comprising: an input port (42) for receiving an optical signal; a demultiplexer (30) for demultiplexing the received optical signal into separate optical signals corresponding to channels of the WDM signal; and a plurality of optical amplifiers (51 to 58) for amplifying each of the separate optical signals.

The difference between claim 1 and Augustsson is that the device be integrated on the same substrate.

Li et al is cited to show that it was known to a person of ordinary skill in the art of optical gain equalization to integrate all components on the same substrate.

It would have been obvious to have applied this teaching to the device of Augustsson when seeking the advantages of a more compact structure.

Claim 2 is taught by port (44) of Augustsson.

Claims 15 – 18 are taught by Augustsson and Li et al as applied to claims 1 and 10.

Art Unit: 3663

Claim 19 would have been obvious because echelle gratings were notoriously well known to the skilled artisan to have performed the function of multiplexing of optical signals.

Claim 34 is taught by the circulator (40) disclosed by Augustsson.

Claims 2-9, 11-14, 20-24 and 35-74 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tervonen and Bazyleenko teach the integration of plural amplifiers on the same substrate. However, neither reference has an effective filing date to qualify as prior art under 35 USC 102 or 103.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Hellner at telephone number 703 306 4155.

Mark Hellner

Primary Examiner

AU 3663

Mark Hellner